CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Government's changing position on Climate change

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Environment and Forests to the Government's changing position on Climate Change.

पर्यावरण और वन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री जयराम रमेश): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं श्रीमती वृंदा कारत जी का, श्री मोइनुल हसन जी का और श्री एन.के. सिंह जी का शुक्रगुजार हूं कि उन्होंने यह Calling Attention Motion की नोटिस दी है। मैं पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्री होने के नाते किसी भी प्रकार की बहस के लिए तैयार हूं। चाहे वह Calling Attention या, Short Duration या Long Duration हो, कुछ भी duration हो...

श्री उपसभापति : उन्होंने Calling Attention के लिए दिया है, तो Calling Attention पर ही बोलिए।

श्री जयराम रमेश : कुछ भी duration हो, मैं तैयार हूं। आज के संदर्भ में सिर्फ Calling Attention है। इस Calling Attention Motion के procedure के तहत एक statement तैयार किया गया है। वह statement यहां आप सब को बांटा जा रहा है। मैं जानता हूं कि...

श्री उपसभापति : आप उसे पढ़िए।

श्री जयराम रमेश : सर, मैं उसे सिर्फ पढ़ना नहीं चाहता हूं, क्योंकि मेरा यह कहना है कि यह एक गम्भीर विषय है। कई चीजें लिखी भी नहीं जाती हैं, बल्कि वे बहस में सामने आती हैं। तो मैं सभी सदस्यों को आश्वासन दिलाना चाहता हूं कि मैं पूरी तरह से तैयार हूं। जो कोई शक है, आशंका है, कोई doubt है, कोई भय है, मैं उसको पूरी तरह से साफ करूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति : नहीं, नहीं। यह Calling Attention है। We have to follow the rules. आप तैयार हैं, लेकिन...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I do not want to go through the formality of reading the Statement because it is not in my habit to read out prepared Statements.

श्री उपसभापति : आप उसे पढ़ दीजिए।

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Let me read it out, but I want to reassure the hon. Members that I am prepared for any debate at any point of time. I have written letters to 72 Members of Parliament, to 30 Chief Ministers explaining the Government's position on climate change and it is in this background that I will read out the Statement.

Sir, I rise to address this august House in response to the Calling Attention Motion concerning the Government's changing position on climate change.

The impacts of climate change due to the manmade accumulation of green house gases such as carbon dioxide are indeed a critical global issue which has been highlighted at almost all international forums since 2007 after the submission of the 4th assessment report of the Inter-Governmental panel on Climate Change and the initiation of the Bali Action Plan, leading to the 15th Conference of Parties at Copenhagen in December, 2009.

The internationally-agreed regime for climate change is laid down in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. UNFCCC as it is called, 1992, under which all industrialized countries have binding commitments to reduce their emissions due to their historical responsibility. The parties to the UNFCCC signed the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 to agree on quantified and specific emission reduction targets for each of the 37 industrialised countries that are listed in the Annexure-I of the Convention.

In December 2007, parties adopted the Bali Action Plan to enhance the implementation of the Convention. Negotiations are currently underway to determine the quantified emission reduction targets of the parties to Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period beginning from 2013 and also define the targets of emission reduction for US, comparable with other Kyoto parties, in pursuance of the Bali Action Plan which calls for full, effective and sustained implementation of the UNFCCC through long-term cooperative action now and beyond 2012. It is a comprehensive dialogue to address the four major building blocks of climate change, namely, mitigation, adaptation, technology and finance.

As per the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities of the UNFCCC, developing countries including India have no obligation to reduce their green house gas emissions. The UNFCCC recognises that economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of the developing countries parties. In course of meeting the developmental needs, the emissions of the developing countries are bound to rise. In recent international negotiations conducted under the UNFCCC, the industrialized countries have called upon developing countries to contribute to the global effort to address climate change. They have suggested that while the developed countries will take appropriate emission reduction targets in the mid term, the developing countries should follow a low carbon development path and deviate in terms of Green House Gas (GHG) emission from the business as usual scenario. It has been suggested that the developing countries should place their domestic mitigation actions at the same level of international review as the mitigation commitments of developed countries.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, India's position in the on-going climate change agreement negotiations is clear, credible and consistent. India's approach to these negotiations is fully anchored in the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. India has argued in international negotiating fora that the developed country parties must take action in accordance with the principle of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities' in order to achieve the objectives of the Convention.

India is acutely conscious of the local impacts of climate change within our own country. Embedded in the UNFCCC and the Bali Action Plan, India is fully alive to its global responsibilities as well. The Prime Minister has already stated that India will never allow its per capita emissions of

Green House Gases to exceed that of the developed countries. Even with 8-9 per cent GDP growth every year for the next two decades, India's per capita emissions is likely to be well below the developed country averages. There is simply no case for the pressure that India, which has among the lowest emissions per capita, has to face to actually reduce its emissions.

While India is willing to accept measurement, reporting and verification or MRV, as it is called, as per agreed procedures for those actions that are supported by the international community in terms of finance and technology through agreed channels, its voluntary actions financed from its own domestic resources cannot be subjected to international review. While India has already taken a number of steps, on its own, to adapt to climate change and mitigate its emission in the interest of its energy security and sustainable development, India will take further voluntary and nationally appropriate actions for addressing climate change strictly in accordance with the priorities and objectives laid down under the National Action Plan on Climate Change. India is engaged in the international negotiations on climate change as a responsible member of the international community. In the recent negotiations in multilateral and bilateral fora, India has articulated its position along the above lines.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me assure through you that the views, opinions and advice of the hon. Members of this august House are indeed invaluable and we wifl be guided by them. Let me also assure the House that we will continue to play a positive role in the international negotiations at Copenhagen without compromising on our national endeavour of social and economic development and eradication of poverty in accordance with the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC, the Bali Action Plan and the Kyoto Protocol.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Members will seek clarifications. Mrs. Brinda Karat.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, in the Chairman's chamber today, we had made a request that the time for discussion on this should be slightly extended because it is a very important matter.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Madam, one second, please. Normally, the Chair will be saying, 'No discussion, clarification', but, here, the Minister is saying, 'let us have a discussion.' But the Chair is saying, 'clarification'.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is because the Chair has to control the House.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, should I request, kindly be a little flexible as far as ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; I only ...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, I don't want to take any more time; I want to start. My only request is, please be a bit flexible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My only request is, please also keep the 'time' in mind.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, the only thing is, this is an extremely technical issue and to grapple with these issues, it does take a bit of time. But since this Calling Attention is limited very specifically to the Government's changing policy, I will try and confine myself to those major points. However, it is necessary, Sir, to also go back to what the agreed policies of the Government's have been ....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please keep the time.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: ... because unless you understand what the agreed policy is, how can you understand what the change is? Therefore, Sir, one point that I would like to make right at the outset is that at present the hon. Prime Minister is in the United States of America and what we learnt from the newspapers today, which is not reflected in your statement at all, is that what the Prime Minister is signing – according to the number of bilateral agreements which are to be signed between the Prime Minister of India and the President of the United States or between the two countries – is an agreement relating precisely to this issue of climate change. What the parameters of that Agreement are, you would know best; the Parliament certainly has not been taken into confidence. So, the first question that arises is, since we are heading towards the Copenhagen Summit and since there are such clearly differentiated positions and responsibilities as far as the discussions in Copenhagen Summit are concerned, what is the haste for India now to rush into a bilateral agreement precisely with that country with which we have the gravest of differences?

So, my first suggestion would be – and I am sure all hon. Members of the House would agree with me – that pending the understanding and discussions of the Copenhagen Summit, it would be much more appropriate to keep pending any such bilateral agreement with the United States of America which concerns any aspect of climate change which is to be discussed in Copenhagen. So, that, I think, is the first point that requires to be made. Why does this point require to be made? Obviously, the Prime Minister, according to the Constitution of India, can go and sign any agreement. But the fact is that the spirit which pervades the entire political sphere is, a breakdown of consensus, and, unfortunately, in the past, on certain issues we have succeeded in having a consensus in spite of deep differences amongst us. One of the areas of consensus was that of national sovereignty. Now, there are different interpretations today of national sovereignty. Some people think that hitching our wagon to that of the United States of America is the best way to defend national sovereignty. My party and I disagree with this, but there are two different positions on this. When you talk about something like climate change, signing agreements and making statements which are binding on India, in the present breakdown of consensus on these issues vis-a-vis our strategic relationship with America, which is leading the charge of the developed capitalist countries against that of the developing countries on issues which are of prime concern to them, I would say,

please, do not do anything without taking Parliament into confidence. I think this is a very important issue. The Government of India should not take Parliament for granted. I want to put on record that there is no consensus, and the reason why there is no consensus, I regret to say, is the unilateral statements and the changing stances, which would put a chameleon to shame, as far as the issue of climate change is concerned. Now, why do I say this?

Sir, on the issue of climate change, there has been much debate. There were Ministers earlier in the BJP Government and there were discussions in the last UPA Government with Left support. And there were certain building blocks which were absolutely incontrovertible and on which there was no controversy. The first thing is that today, in this entire issue of emission of Greenhouse gases, the responsibility of the developed capitalist world has been recognised by the Kyoto Protocol, and by the subsequent agreements and discussions which the Minister has very kindly reminded us of in his statement. So, one thing is the responsibility of the developed capitalist world. There is this predatory nature of capitalism to grab the largest share of the common space. Today, 75 per cent of that entire space has been captured by the developed capitalist world; where they have a population of only 20 per cent, they have captured 80 per cent; there is very little Carbon space left. And, therefore, the agreed position that the Government had taken was that (1) The control of emissions by the developed world has to be the basis for any further action; (2) Whatever actions developing countries like India take are linked to that, and in all these negotiations the pressure was to delink, saying, you are equally responsible, particularly the growing economies like China and India. We are being blamed for the higher emissions. And, therefore, the entire effort of the industrialised and developed world is to delink what they have done in the past, the crimes they have committed in capturing that space in the past, and the actions that are required today. Therefore, the issue of linking our domestic actions with that of the actions of the industrialised countries are also key to the consensus which are developed in this country.

The third very important point was that they had to pay; the Kyoto Protocol had common but differentiated responsibilities, and linked to this was that the polluters had to pay, both in terms of money as well as technology transfer. These were some of the basic blocks on which there was a consensus and the political strategy emanating from that, as far as India is concerned, was always in coordination with the Group of 77 countries, more recently with the five other countries within that Group, So, this was the political strategy which India had adopted and this had a wide consensus. Now, we find that there is a major shift on this. There are three notes which were circulated. I was the fortunate recipient of the Minister's letter to selected Members of Parliament and Chief Ministers. I was very happy to receive that letter, in that letter, he has said the same thing that he is saying here that we are committed to Kyoto, we are committed to the positions that we have had, etc., etc. Very

soon after that letter reached us was a Report published in a national newspaper, The Times of India, by a very, I would say, committed reporter who follows these things and that Report was concerning a so-called Discussion Note sent by the hon. Minister, Jairam Rameshji, supposedly to the Prime Minister, and that became a calling attention motion for the entire country because we all read that what the Minister was writing to MPs is something entirely different from what the Minister was writing to the Prime Minister. So, that, of course, itself was a red alert. At that time, the Congress managers and others in the PMO said, "No, this is his individual opinion. This has got nothing to do with Government policy." They tried to assuage the apprehensions and fears. But on November 16, when the Minister made his official Statement to the pre-Copenhagen Summit, we found exactly those same shifts clearly stated in the Minister's Statement. Now, what are these? That is what I want to come to.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much do you need?

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, I have five points to make. ...*(Interruptions)*... Since I have already given the background, with your kind permission I am just going to delineate to you and to this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much time do you need?

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Maybe ten to fifteen minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Already you have taken ten minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, in the Statement here ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Others also need that much time. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: I will finish it quickly. In the Statement here he said, "The Prime Minister has already stated that India will never allow its per capita emissions to exceed that of the developed countries." Exactly the Prime Minister had made that Statement earlier in Germany in 2007 and then again when you released the National Action Plan. And what did he say? He said, "We will not exceed." What did the Minister say in the pre-Copenhagen meeting? I will read it out from his Statement. "India is prepared to reflect in any Agreement its commitment to keep its per capita emissions below that of the developing countries." The Prime Minister says, "We will not exceed." The national consensus is on conversion. And what does the Minister say, "We will keep per capita emissions below that of the developing countries." If this is not a major shift in our policy, then what constitutes a shift? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: This is a shift in language. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: This is a major shift. What is the shift in language? We are not talking about semantics here. In your Statement, you are talking about 'exceeding', and in this Statement you are saying that you will not go 'below'. What does it mean? It constitutes a major shift. India is prepared to reflect ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: She is confused herself. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Please Jairam*ji*. Let me read it out again. This is Prime Minister's Statement: "In the meantime, I have already declared, as India's Prime Minister, that despite of developmental imperatives, our per capita GHG emissions will not exceed the per capita GHG emissions of the developed countries."

What does the Minister say? "India is prepared to reflect in any agreement its commitment to keep its per capita emissions below that of the developed countries." Undoubtedly, that is not an issue of language. It is an issue of making a commitment that you are going below that of the developed countries. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Brindaji, please conclude.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: The second point, Sir.

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Let her place her points. The Minister is also agreeing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not the Minister agreeing. Please, let us not argue. It is not the Minister agreeing. It is the House; the time allocated. Please conclude.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: The second point is about delinking. This is what he says. In this statement which he has made, he has made certain unilateral commitments in an international forum which are delinked from the actions that the developed countries are expected to take. And, not only that, our domestically financed action plans are now going to be open for international consultations. What does his statement say?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Brindaji, this is not the way.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, please, this is a very important point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, this is not. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, listen to me for a minute. If you are taking fifteen minutes, how can I deny fifteen minutes to the other Members? Please tell me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN (Kerala): Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't support. It is between me and Member. I don't want your support. I am requesting Brindaji to conclude. How can I refuse fifteen minutes to other Members if I give that much time to you?

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, I will just read it out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: I will not make any comments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It does not mean that you can take all the time.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: I will read it without any comments. Sir, this is another statement which he has made. "India has several nationally appropriate mitigation actions which it is considering to convert into nationally accountable mitigation outcomes." And, this he has prepared to put under a basis for international consultations. ...(Time-bell rings)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. N.K. Singh.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: In other words, Sir, a national action plan, which is domestically financed, is now going to be open for international consultation; it does allow an international intervention in our domestic affairs. This is another significant change in it. And, third the most important aspect is. ...(Time-bell rings)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Brindaji, will it help us? This is not the way of helping.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Please, let me complete this point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will leave to you, whatever time you want.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: The third most important aspect is, in this entire...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If hon. Members don't understand, what can we do?

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: In this entire statement, the important issue of India insisting on transfer of technology and funds from the industrialised country has not been mentioned at all. In other words, what we are now stating is. ...(Time-bell rings)... exactly in this paragraph of the Minister in which he has delineated the demands of the industrialised countries. The Minister's statement on November 16th signals an acceptance and acquiescence by India to all those demands of the industrialised countries.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. N.K. Singh.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: And, the last point I want to make is that in his letter, the last point in his letter to the Prime Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already made that point.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: The Minister has said, "We should. ...(Time-bell rings)... distance ourselves. India must not stick to G-77 alone." ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, this is not the way of. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: We must realise that it is now embedded to G-20. ...(Interruptions) Sir, the entire political strategy. ...(Time-bell rings)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Brindaji, do you want. ...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: ...which the United States wants to impose on India, isolate India. ...(Time-bell rings)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude.

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया (झारखंड) : सर, इनको बोलने दीजिए।

श्री उपसभापति : अब देखिए, ये कहते हैं कि बोलने दीजिए। We have so much legislative business. We have not completed any legislative business. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: ...isolate India from the developing world and thereby strengthen its own strategy. It is exactly the strategy which is. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let this time be allocated to other Members.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: How can I make a point? This is not correct. Please let me complete. Sir, please understand when he has said in his letter to the Prime Minister, he wants to shift...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever you want to say, you have said.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: ...shift from G-77 countries.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are repeating. Everytime, you are referring to the letter to the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, there are ten points. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary that every point should be repeated. ...*(Interruptions)*... You are a senior Member. You are an experienced Member. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI AMAR SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): For an ignorant Member like us, it is very important that she speaks. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I would like to mention that the Member. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, she is repeatedly referring to my letter to the Prime Minister. I want her to authenticate that letter. ...*(Interruptions)*... I want her to authenticate that letter. I am challenging her, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am challenging her.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, this entire approach of the Government of India is in tune. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Brinda ji, you have taken sufficient time. Please understand.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, it is in tune with the. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your point is not the only point which should go on in the House.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, it is in tune with the strategic alliance, which is being pushed by the United States of America; ...(Time-bell rings)... the shift in the climate change negotiations signalled by various statements of the Environment Minister is clearly reflected in that weakening before the United States of America.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. N.K. Singh.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: And, therefore, Sir, we strongly reject this. We demand a full-fledged discussion on this, and, before going to Copenhagen, the Government should take the sense of the House and only that sense should inform our discussions and interventions in Copenhagen.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN (West Bengal): Sir, henceforth, the individual member will not give the name. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is not a general discussion. It is a Calling Attention. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a Calling Attention. You read the rules. It is not that all the Members who give the notice. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Next time, individual member will not give name. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. It is only party-wise; Notice by any number of Members can be given. ...*(Interruptions)*... Time is fixed, and, within that time, we have to do it. Read the rules regarding Calling Attention. Please go through the Rules. Mr. N.K. Singh.

SHRI N.K. SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in view of the brevity of time, I am going to raise only a couple of important issues. Brinda ji has touched on some important issues. I do not share her perception on some of them but she has certainly highlighted some very critical issues on which there is an emerging national consensus, which we need to protect.

First of all, I must thank the Secretariat for rightly placing this subject, hopefully, under the domain of the Minister for Environment and Forests. I hope that whereas he is incharge, he has the mandate to be able to commit the country's negotiating position, considering the multiplicity of organisations, the conflicts which have emanated between them, considering that the Prime Minister has a Special Group with a Special Envoy whose views are often at variance with the views expressed by the Minister for Forests and Environment, Therefore, we hope very much that in the thirteen days to go before Copenhagen, more than thirteen contradictions which are evident, will be resolved in some credible manner.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN) in the chair.

We also hope that the Minister, when he has listed the six critical issues, namely, the issue of adaptation, namely, to adapt to the inevitable consequences of climate change; the issue of mitigation on what can be done to avert the kind of prospect which looks inevitable; the issue of technology, namely, availability of technology at costs which are affordable to countries like India; the issue of finance on the burden sharing in managing climate change; the issue of technology; and the issue of management verification, are issues on which, Sir, there will be parallel negotiations, many

parallel activities, and, we will need to bind them together in an overarching framework. So, my first suggestion to the hon. Minister is not to regard Copenhagen to be an event, please regard it as a process. And, from the point of view, I share the view which Brindaji has expressed that while the G-2, perhaps, in China has already, to some extent, poured a lot of cold water, lowering expectations on what can happen from Copenhagen, we should also be in no hurry to enter into arrangements which are not in our long-term interest.

Having said this, Sir, I have some important considerations which India should have. First and foremost that for a country like India, it is only ethical and it is oniy expeditious that per capita income and per capita emission must be the credible basis for making commitments. Having said this, we must not be unmindful of the fact that whereas we may not have been a contributor to the global stock of pollution, we are an important contributor to the flow of pollution. Therefore, when we are taking on obligations, we need to view these obligations in a manner of historicity between stocks and flows. The second important consideration, Sir, which we need to have is common and differentiated responsibility is a well-accepted principle. But, having said this, let us know that we must not allow our shoulders to be used for being firing the guns of others. Common and differentiated responsibility, Sir, in today's context helps really a very important neighbour of ours which is having one power station being fired every week. Therefore, we need to view the common and differentiated responsibility in a manner which is flexible enough, an astringent view on Annexe-I countries and Annexe-II countries would mitigate against long-term advantages.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please put your question and then finish.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: Yes, I am going to ask the questions only, Sir. I will require about 5-7 minutes for your indulgence. Third, Sir, considering that the Chair had been fairly indulgent, and for good reasons, to the very important points made by Brindaji, I hope, you will be able to take some measure of indulgence, perhaps not of the same extent.

Third, Sir, on voluntary action on energy intensity, something which even the Chinese have agreed, the proposals of the Environment Minister, in my view, are credible enough to lure the energy intensity, and some of the suggestions, therefore, embedded on a letter, written or not written by him, but reported in the newspaper, look to be efforts in the same direction and are credible. They are reasonable and we should try and encourage greater national dialogue on that. Fourth, consistent with international disclosures, I agree that its international disclosures must be confined for those areas where technology and finance have been exogenously available. And, that must be a guiding principle. Having said this, we must also recognise that in today's inter-dependent world, technology and finance are both fungible, and, therefore, you cannot push this button beyond a point. Fifth, Sir, investment approach to mitigation recognises that there is a historicity of opportunity

to invest in infrastructure for low carbon growth. There is nothing deterministic about the relationship between emission and growth, between emission and poverty reduction. India is about to lock in to a high-growth trajectory. ...(**Time-bell rings**)... Let it be a low carbon growth trajectory.

Sir, being not very reasonable, if I may say so, and I think this House must accept consistent norms. My preceding Speaker has spoken for exactly 22 minutes. I am not seeking 22 minutes. But I will expect you to take a reasonable and a fair view.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Mr. Singh, as per the rules ..*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI N.K. SINGH: Sir, I am not contesting that. You are the final arbiter of the rules. But the rules were just interpreted a few minutes ago in a particular way. ...(Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J.KURIEN): No, no. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Since you raised it, the first Speaker can ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N.K. SINGH: You are the final arbiter of the rules, Sir. Nobody will question that, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J.KURIEN): Listen please ...*(Interruptions)*... One second ...*(Interruptions)*... The first speaker is always allowed to take more time. Other Speakers take less time.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: I am not seeking any of that measure of time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): No, no. You please put your question.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: That is what I am doing, Sir.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Questions are very difficult and lengthy questions. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please allow him to speak.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: We must distinguish between who adjusts and who pays for it. Developed countries like India have a historic opportunity to leapfrog than retrofit. These may be expensive but does not mean that India must pay for it. We must show imagination, innovate, create jobs and bargain that the burden of payment does not rest upon our shoulders. Finally, Sir, the dynamics of international negotiations always need flexibility. Developed countries have yet to demonstrate, I entirely agree with Brindaji, seriousness of intent and coherence of action to persuade poorer countries like India in accepting concomitant obligations.

National interest must be paramount. However, boxing ourselves in a corner cannot augur well for negotiating outcomes. Rising economic clout of India has concomitant international obligations. We need to show vision and leadership qualities at Copenhagen, And you can do that, Minister, if

you educate us a little more and have flexibility and an approach which protects India's paramount interest and is consistent with India showing leadership abilities in 13 days from now in Copenhagen. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudy, please confine yourself to five minutes.

SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY (Bihar): Sir, such important issues should not be confined to a calling attention, I think it should have been a bigger debate.

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विषय पर चर्चा पिछली बार भी सदन में बहुत विस्तार से हुई थी और मुझे स्मरण है कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जी मेजर इकोनामिक फोरम की बैठक में गए थे, तो वहीं से उन्होंने एक रूप दिया था, स्वरूप दिया था और उन्होंने कहा था कि, 'We will accept two degree cap' और जब हम लोगों ने पिछली बार सदन में चर्चा के दौरान सवाल उठाया कि प्रधान मंत्री ने किस उद्देश्य के तहत यह घोषणा कर दी कि हम two degree cap स्वीकार करेंगे। इसी सदन में मंत्री जी ने इसको कहीं न कहीं घुमा-फिराकर कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो मेजर इकोनामिक फोरम में बातें रखी थीं और जिस दस्तावेज पर हस्ताक्षर किया था, it was an aspiration मतलब वह हमारी सोच थी और उसी समय से यह contradiction शुरू हुआ और दुनियाभर के लोग, जब इतने बड़े forum पर प्रधान मंत्री जी गए, तो उन्होंने कहा कि भारत के साथ कोई कठिनाई नहीं है। भारत तैयार है और भारत दुनिया के साथ कदम से कदम मिलाकर चलने के लिए तैयार है और हम टू डिग्री केपिंग के लिए तैयार हैं। जब सदन में हम लोगों ने इस विषय को उठाया, तो मंत्री जी बिल्कुल उलट गए और कहा कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जी वहां गए थे, तो सोच रहे थे कि हमारी कल्पना है। एक तरफ हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री हस्ताक्षर करके आते हैं और दूसरी तरफ सदन में मंत्री कहते हैं कि वह सिर्फ प्रधान मंत्री जी की एक कल्पना थी। अब हम उस बात को वहीं से शुरू करें, जिस कल्पना के बारे में चर्चा हुई और आज हम किस स्थिति तक वहां पहुंच गए हैं।

महोदय, विरोधाभास इस देश के वरिष्ठ मंत्रियों के माध्यम से, प्रधान मंत्री का बयान, मंत्री का बयान और आजकल तो यह भी पता चलने लगा है कि मंत्री जी को कि इस सरकार में बहुत पढ़े-लिखे मंत्री हैं, कुछ अच्छे काम कर रहे हैं और कुछ और भी अच्छे काम करना चाह रहे हैं, कुछ विदेश का काम देख रहे हैं, तो सरकार में कुछ बोलने की परम्परा बन गई है। महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि आपने अध्ययन किया है। आप थोड़ा तारतम्य अपने विभाग से बैठाएं, कई ऐसे समाचार प्रकाशित हो रहे हैं, जिसमें प्रधान मंत्री जी की सोच कुछ और है, मंत्री जी की सोच कुछ और तथा विभाग की सोच कुछ और है। इसमें अगर आप सामंजस्य नहीं बैठाएंगे, तो दुनिया के लोग पूरी चीज को देख रहे हैं। आपका बयान, आपके निगोशिएटर का बयान और प्रधान मंत्री का बयान और जब भी आप अंतर्राष्ट्रीय फोरम पर बैठते हैं, तो वे सभी कागजों को आपके सामने रख देते हैं और आपको अपना सिर झुकाना पड़ता है। हमने इस विषय को इसलिए देखा है कि कोपेनहेगन में जाने से पहले जो बाली एक्शन प्लान था, बाली एक्शन प्लान में आपने कहा कि लिटिगेशन होगा, अडॉप्टेशन होगा, हम अपनी कैपेसिटी बिल्डिंग करेंगे और 2007 से क्योटो प्रोटेकाल से आप चलते आ रहे थे। आपने लगातार चलकर तय किया कि दुनिया के सामने कि हम इस स्वरूप में, इस अपने क्लाइमेट चेंज के दस्तावेज को पूरा करेंगे, लेकिन कहीं न कहीं बड़े देशों का, मुझे क्षमा

करेंगे, लेफ्ट पार्टीज़ का obsession अमेरिका है। मैं इसमें यह कहना चाहूंगा कि सिर्फ अमेरिकीनिज्म नहीं है, सिर्फ अमेरिका के कारण नहीं है, जितने विकसित देश हैं, वे कमजोर देश को, विकासशील देशों को दबाना चाहते हैं, सिर्फ अमेरिका का यह प्रयास नहीं है। क्योंकि अमेरिका वामपंथियों के लिए एक महत्वपूर्ण विषय होता है, इसलिए अमेरिका तक सीमित है। लेकिन उसमें सारे विकसित देश हैं, जो दुनियाभर में उत्सर्जन कर रहे हैं, पॉल्युशन कर रहे हैं, लेकिन भारत और भारत जैसे विकासशील देशों पर वे दबाव बनाना चाह रहे हैं।

महोदय, हम आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से क्योटो प्रोटोकाल के बारे में पूछना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि अमेरिका और विकसित देश कहते हैं कि अब उसे वहीं समाप्त कर दिया जाए। क्योटो प्रोटोकाल के तहत मैं आपसे पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्योटो प्रोटोकाल में कुछ कमिटमेंट्स थे, The developed nations have to meet these commitments. अब वे चाहते हैं कि आप उस बात को भुला दें और नये सिरे से नया समझौता करके दुनिया को फिर एक बार उस समझौते के तहत लाओ, यह एक चिंता का विषय है, जिसके बारे में, हम जानना चाहते हैं। शब्दों का उपयोग अंतर्राष्ट्रीय माहौल में किया जाता है, 'common but differential responsibility' अब इन शब्दों का उपयोग किस देश द्वारा किस तरह से किया जाएगा और कौन-सा दायित्व आपको सौंपा जाएगा, यह हमेशा एक प्रश्न बना रहता है।

महोदय, जब हम उत्सर्जन की बात कहते हैं, तो हम बार-बार कह देते हैं कि जो हमारा carbon emission है, वह अभी 1.4 टन है, जबकि अमेरिका जैसे देश का 20 टन है और वर्ल्ड एवरेज़ लगभग 4 टन के आसपास है। कोई भी आदमी स्वाभाविक तौर से यह कहेगा कि जब हमने इस दुनिया में आज तक ऐसा उत्सर्जन नहीं किया, पॉल्युशन नहीं किया, तो आखिर हम उसका भुगतान क्यों करें? आखिर हम उसकी भागीदारी क्यों करें? जब हम भागीदारी करेंगे, तो एक तरफ जब आप इस भागीदारी में भाग लेने की बात कर रहे हें, तो आप चाहते हैं कि हम पर कुछ binding commitments हों। हम यह कहना चाहेंगे कि जो binding commitments की चर्चा आती है, तो आखिर यह बार-बार क्यों आती है? विशेषकर भारत के ऊपर बार-बार यह दबाव क्यों डाला जाता है कि भारत ही एक कमजोर देश दिखता है, जिस पर कहा जाता है कि आप binding commitments कर लें, आखिर, ऐसा क्यों होता है? यह ऐसी स्थिति क्यों है विकासशील देशों में बार-बार यह दबाव भारत पर डाला जाता है क्योंकि पूरी दुनिया भारत की तरफ देखती है। सभी विकसित देश भारत पर दबाव डालते हैं, ऐसा क्यों होता है? क्या आप बहुत ज्यादा अमेरिका और विकसित देशों की गुडविल के लिए अपने आप अपनी स्वायत्ता समाप्त कर देना चाहते हैं? ऐसा क्या कमी है, जो भारत को ही सबसे कमजोर देखा जाता है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी बार-बार यह कहते हैं कि भारत को आठ से नौ प्रतिशत तक का विकास करना है। जब आपको नौ प्रतिशत विकास करना है, तो आपको निश्चित रूप से बिजली की आवश्यकता होगी। भारत में थर्मल पावर्स है, जिनसे हम कोयले से बिजली का उत्पादन करते हैं। जब आप यह कहते हैं कि इससे emission सबसे अधिक होता है, तो एक तरफ आपके सामने गरीबी है, दूसरी तरफ विकास है, औद्योगीकरण है। आज भी हम अपने आपको गरीब मानते हैं, क्योंकि इस देश में बहुत सारी ऐसी आवश्यकताओं को पूरा करना है। आप कहते हैं कि इसमें शिफ्ट होना है, We should look for an alternative source of energy. हम इसको कैसे करेंगे? हमारे पास साधन कहां है? आज

अगर भारत में प्रत्येक व्यक्ति, हर उद्योगपति यह तय भी कर ले कि सबसे अधिक उत्सर्जन करेंगे, पॉल्युशन करेंगे, तो फिर हम दुनिया के अनुपात में पहुंच ही नहीं सकते हैं, क्योंकि हमारे पास साधन ही नहीं हैं, चाहे हम अपनी पूरी ताकत लगा दें। यदि हम अगले सौ वर्षों तक अपनी ताकत लगा देंगे, फिर भी सबसे ज्यादा पॉल्युशन करेंगे। आज हमारे पास साधन कहां हैं? आज हमारे पास पैसे कहां है? हम साधनों के अभाव में उस हद तक कैसे पहुंच सकते हैं? महोदय, कहीं न कहीं इसमें यह जरूरी है कि हम इस विषय का सामंजस्य स्थापित करें, जबकि हम वहां जा रहे हैं। दुनिया के विकसित देशों ने अपने यहां गरीबी की लड़ाई लड़ ली है। They have become happy, they are good. आज अमेरिका में जिस प्रकार से उपभोक्तावाद है, भौतिकवाद है, हम उसमें उनके सामने कहीं भी नहीं हैं। महोदय, दुनिया के लोगों में हम यह चर्चा करते हैं कि विकसित देशों को कल की चिंता है। अगले सौ साल में उसका असर हमारे बच्चों पर क्या होगा? हमें कल की भी चिंता है और हमें आज की भी चिंता है। हमें आज की भूख की चिंता है और कल के भविष्य की चिंता है, इसमें कहीं न कहीं सामंजस्य लाने की आवश्यकता है। जो विकसित देश हैं,वे सौ साल आगे की सोच रहे हैं, हम वर्तमान की सोच रहे हैं। हम आज भूख की सोच रहे हैं। आज हम गरीबी की सोच रहे हैं। जिस प्रकार से हमारे देश ने इन समस्याओं का सामना करना है, हमें कहीं न कहीं इस बड़ी पेचीदा समस्या पर ध्यान देना होगा। कोई ऐसा कमिटमेंट न हो, कल को हम यह तय न करें कि अगर हमें बिहार में कोई फैक्ट्री लगानी हो, मध्य प्रदेश में कोई फैक्ट्री लगानी हो, तो इसको अमेरिका तय करेगा, आस्ट्रेलिया करेगा। ...(**समय की घंटी**)... कहीं न कहीं एक बड़ी साजिश बन सकती है, जिससे हमें सचेत होना पड़ेगा। महोदय, आप क्या चाहेंगे?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You have taken six minutes. Take one or two minutes and conclude. Put your questions.

श्री राजीव प्रताप रूडी : महोदय, मेरा सवाल यह है कि मंत्री जी कोपेनहेगन में जाएंगे और इस समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर करके आएंगे। हमने भारतवर्ष में पॉपुलेशन पर, अपनी जनसंख्या पर नियंत्रण किया है। इस पूरे समझौते में जो व्यक्ति जिस प्रकार से अपनी जीवन शैली को रखता है, उपयोग करता है, उपभोग करता है, उससे carbon foot print बनता है। हमारा carbon foor print दुनिया में सबसे कमजोर है, क्योंकि हमारे पास साधन नहीं है। आज भी जब हम अपनी संख्या को कम करने की बात करते हैं, तो आज भारत अपने सामने आबादी की चुनौती को स्वीकार करता है। जब हम इस आबादी की चुनौती को स्वीकार करते हुए, उसे कम करना चाहते हैं, तो क्या अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर, उस चुनौती को जो हम अपने देश के भीतर लगा रहे हैं, हम अपनी आबादी को नियंत्रित कर रहे हैं, क्या अंतर्राष्ट्रीय पैमाने पर इसकी कोई पहचान बन रही है? बहुत से ऐसे पैमाने हैं, आज आप यह सहमति प्रदान कर रहे हैं कि उत्सर्जन में कटौती की जाए, लेकिन पिछले 55-60 वर्षों में भारत के भीतर जितना हमने पर्यावरण की दृष्टि से प्रयास किया है, क्या उसको अंतर्राष्ट्रीय पैमाने पर कोई अहमियत मिल सकेगी। अगर इन सभी विषयों को समेकित ढंग से विचार करके अंतर्राष्ट्रीय पैमाने पर रखें तो शायद एक पहलू बन सकता है। आप कदम बढ़ा रहे हैं, उस कदम बढ़ाने में एक सामंजस्य बनाकर, यदि इस देश की आवश्यकताओं, गरीबी, भुखमरी, विकास और आने वाले भविष्य की चिंता करते हुए इस समझौते पर बढ़ें तो निश्चित रूप से हमारा समर्थन आपके साथ रहेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Thank you, Mr. Rudy, Shri Syed Azeez Pasha. He is not here. Shri Sanjay Raut.

श्री संजय राउत (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इस सदन में कोपेनहेगन के बारे में चर्चा हो रही है। चर्चा तो होती है, आज कोपेनहेगन है, कल दूसरा देश होगा, दूसरी आर्गूमेंट होगी, लेकिन मुंबई जैसे शहर, जिसको ग्लोबल वार्मिंग का सबसे ज्यादा खतरा है, उसके बारे में मैं सिर्फ दो-तीन क्लैरिफिकेशन्स पूछना चाहूंगा। Sir, it will not be wrong if we say that Mumbai is sinking and that is due to global warming and large-scale reclamation. But, Sir, I am sorry to say that such an important issue is quite neglected and also, not much planning is being done about it. Sir, there is no preventive solution or a prior notice to climate effect or any specific change expected in the time to come. अभी फयान हो गया, "फयान" से ज्यादा नुकसान मुम्बई को हो गया। मुंबई के आसपास जो समुद्री तट है, उनको हो गया। उसके बारे में कोई जानकारी न पहले मिली थी, न जो कुछ नुकसान हुआ, उसके बारे में भी हमें सचेत किया गया था। मेरा सिर्फ एक क्लैरिफिकेशन है। मैं चाहता हूं कि जब हमें इस प्रकार की जो वार्निंग मिलती है, दो महीने पहले फयान की बात होती थी कि फयान आने वाला है, लेकिन न मुंबई को किसी ने सचेत किया था, न ही हमारे कोंकण के जो समुद्री तट हैं, उनको सचेत किया था, इसलिए लगभग दो सौ से ज्यादा मछुआरे आज भी लापता हैं। उनका सबसे बड़ा नुकसान हुआ है। दूसरी बात यह है कि मुंबई महाराष्ट्र की कैपिटल सिटी है, मुंबई देश को सबसे ज्यादा योगदान देती है, हम मुंबई को देश का फाइनेंशियल सेंटर कहते हैं। अगर आज हम मुंबई को ग्लोबल वार्मिंग से खत्म होने का डर है, डूबने का संशय है, तो मैं आपसे सिर्फ इतना पूछना चाहता हूं कि मुंबई को बचाने के लिए आपके पास क्या ऐक्शन प्लान है? आप मुझे बताइए कि आप मुंबई के लिए क्या करना चाहते हैं? यह मुंबई और देश की जनता भी जानना चाहती है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. JURIEN): Thank you, Mr. Raut.

श्री अमर सिंह : सर, मैं आपके माध्यम से अपने मित्र जयराम जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं ...(**व्यवधान**)... अखबारों में मैंने पढ़ा है, मैं आपसे कोई चुनौती नहीं चाहता हूं, जैसा आपने ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया : जयराम जी के बीच में श्री जोड़ देते तो बात खत्म हो जाती।

श्री अमर सिंह : जैसाकि उन्होंने मेरी साथी वृंदा जी को दिया कि पत्र के बारे में बताओ, सच्चा है कि झूठा है, लेकिन मैं सिर्फ जानकारी चाहता हूं, मैंने अखबारों में पढ़ा कि इस महत्वपूर्ण मसले पर, कार्बन एमिशन्स के मसले पर, प्रधानमंत्री कार्यालय में और इनके इस विषय पर जो सलाहकार हैं उनमें और आप में गंभीर मतभेद है। हम अभी तक आपकी सरकार के समर्थक दल हैं। आप मानें न मानें हम अभी तक तो हैं। हम लोगों से प्रश्न पूछा जाता है कि आपके वन और पर्यावरण मंत्री का एक विचार है और इस विषय पर प्रधान मंत्री कार्यालय के जो उनके नियुक्त सलाहकार हैं, उनका एक विचार है। मेरा एक सीधा-सरल प्रश्न है कि यह जो मतों की विभिन्नता है, वह आपकी कोपेनहेगन की संभावित यात्रा के पहले समरसता पर आ जाएगी या नहीं, या इसमें विषमता रहेगी? यह जो समाचार पत्रों में चित्रण है, यह चित्रण उतना ही सच है। जितनी कमेटी की रिपोर्टें सच्ची हैं, जो लीक हो जाती हैं, क्योंकि आजकल तो समाचार पत्रें की credibility सदन से ज्यादा हो गई है। समाचार पत्रों में पढ़ कर पता चलता है कि सदन में अगले दिन क्या होगा। इसलिए समाचार पत्रों की प्रामाणिकता पर विश्वास करते हुए, विश्वसनीय

मानते हुए, क्योंकि दो-दो रिपोर्टें वहां अग्रिम रूप से आ गईं और वही सत्यापित हुईं, इस मत की विभिन्नता को भी सत्य मान कर, क्योंकि मैंने समाचार पत्रों में पढ़ा है, मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं कि कृपया बताइए कि यह विषमता है या समता है - प्रधान मंत्री के आपसे संबंधित मंत्रालय के सलाहकार में और आदरणीय मंत्री महोदय, मेरे माननीय मित्र श्री जयराम जी, आपमें, क्योंकि अगर विषमता है, तब तो बड़ी मुश्किल है और अगर समता है, तो आप बता दीजिए कि समता है? मैं कोई चुनौती नहीं दे रहा हूं। प्रामाणिक समाचार पत्र, जो सदन से पहले अग्रिम सूचनाएं देते हैं, उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री के सलाहकार और माननीय मंत्री जी के आपसी वैचारिक द्वंद्व की अग्रिम सूचना दी है। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Thank you, Amar Singhji. Shri D. Raja. He is not there. Shri Azeez Pasha.

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I completely agree with what Mrs. Brinda Karat has said in regard to the change of stand of the Government. The very same Government had put up a very stiff fight in Kyoto by signing the Protocol. Now we are suspicious whether we are going to stick to the same thing or whether we are going to be pressurised under the bilateral agreement which we are going to sign. There is some change. Mr. Rajeev Pratap Rudy was saying that the Communists are obsessed with the US. It is not a question of obsession with the US because the US is the leader of all developed countries. They are the main polluters. जैसे कहा जाता है, "उल्टा चोर कोतवाल को डाँटे।" ये जितने भी developed countries हैं, वे असल polluters हैं। जब हम अमेरिका बोलते हैं, तो इसका मतलब है कि we are concerned about all the developed countries. So, keeping in view the vital interests of our country we should be over cautious while going to Copenhagen. While endorsing the views of my colleague, Mrs. Brinda Karat, my party and I also want to express the same sort of caution that we should take into consideration the interests of our nation, and we should not be carried away by any sort of pressure from any corner as is happening in the bilateral agreement. Thank you very much.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir, the climate issue is taken as an environmental issue some time. I would like to remind the hon. Minister that there is a taluka known as Canacona in Goa which he has visited recently in some other connection. Now in that taluka, all of a sudden, there was constant rain for five hours. After five hours the entire taluka was flooded. Nobody had seen such a flood for centuries. But the surprising part is this. Even after two months, no technical man, whether weather chief or the NIO or anybody, could say what the reason is. Now the NIO is stating that because there were rains earlier and the soil was soaked in water, the soil could not take in any additional water, and, therefore, there was flood. The technicians said this after two months. The weather chief was saying that he was holidaying on that day and his people were also holidaying on that day. This is the sort of weathermen in Panaji. I would urge the hon. Minister that in such circumstances criminal prosecution should be launched against the persons who have been negligent.

Secondly, climate has become a weapon today. We can understand snow melting. Now that is going to be used as a weapon by our enemies. They want to melt the snows in the Himalayas and destroy the country. Reports are emanating from different angles. Kindly throw some light on that.

Lastly, if we had to believe our TV channels, nobody would have survived at this point of time. They have given 2012 as the date when we all would be finished. Some other channels have given five dates of different years when we all would be finished; the entire world would be finished. Are you allowing such predictions? Are you allowing such telecast to create havoc among the masses? This issue does not concern the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, It concerns you. You have to take up this matter at the highest level to find a solution to this problem. Thank you.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are discussing a very important subject, which in the last few years, has almost brought to the fore the desire of the developed countries like India as also the poorer countries, to get their own share of a cleaner environment. We are also concerned, as the opening speaker, Shrimati Brinda Karat, has mentioned, that the whole world has accepted the principle that the polluter must pay. The genesis of this negotiation has been that the nature was supposed to be fair and equal for all, but today the nature is becoming an instrument of unfairness. The developed countries have polluted it to such an extent that the developing and the poorer countries will now have to pay the cost and face the consequences for the pollution caused by the developed world. The key to this negotiation really is, as mentioned by some of the preceding speakers, the cost of switchover of this technology, the cost of capping our own emission norms. We are one of those countries which have still not developed enough. Therefore, if our emission norms are capped to such an unreasonable extent and we do not have the resources for the changed technology, our norms itself would be capped and our growth itself would be capped. Our entire fight against poverty and for removal of that poverty itself will suffer. The statement of the hon. Minister very rightly mentions today that we have had a consistent position. He has also written to some of the Members of Parliament where he had said that we have a very clear and consistent position on this. Why is it that doubts have arisen about the consistency of our position? One doubt is very clear as to what happened a few months ago to which my friend, Shri Rudy, has referred. When we were almost compelled to accept the position, which the Minister himself, in the presence of the US Secretary of State, had to dilute the position which we had accepted, a question was raised: "Are we diluting our position under pressure from some of the developed countries?"

But the second issue seems to be more serious today. That is an issue which my friend, Shri Amar Singh, has just now referred to. We live in a Parliamentary System, where the Cabinet and the Government are responsible, to the Parliament. Every Minister is part of the collective responsibility of that Cabinet. Even when we speak in terms of a consistent and a clear stand, which we have had –

on which, at least, for the last decade and a half, there has been consistency irrespective of change of Governments – there are, today, some doubts being raised and these are those doubts which the opening speaker, Shrimati Brinda Karat, has referred to, that there is an uneasy feeling – we would like the Minister to be candid about it - which all of us have reflected, the media occasionally reflects and various sections in the Government reflect that somewhat the Minister is not a part, and is not in full agreement and in tandem with that consistent stand which the Government of India has had for all these years. There have been references that India has been one of the leading nations as far as the developing countries are concerned. We are amongst the leaders of the G-77, which is a group of 131 countries. Not only in the climate change negotiations, in WTO and also in other negotiations, we along with Brazil, along with South Africa and along with China, are amongst the leaders of those negotiations. Now it appears that the Minister has views that we must no longer continue to lead this group of G-77; we must have our own independent position. On emission norms, is he in agreement with the consistent stand which he has evolved? Thirdly, instead of accepting internationally binding emission cuts, which the Minister has consistently said that they would oppose, I will be fair to him in acknowledging that fact he has said, "We will have a domestic legislation under which we will impose cuts on ourselves and open that out for international review or international consultations." Now, is that another way of reaching the same position which the Minister seeks to deny? Now, the question is: Is there a consistent stand that we have? The Prime Minister's Office has a Special Envoy. You have a set of negotiators. You have statements emanating from the Minister, coming from time to time, and at times, those statements are no longer consistent with what our negotiators on the international fora are arguing. It has happened more than once that our negotiators are putting across a particular viewpoint at the international negotiations, and exactly at the same time, a statement to the contrary emanates from the Minister, and that embarrasses the position of our negotiators. So much so, our negotiators have put it down in writing, and have acknowledged this embarrassment, which they have had, in writing, that these statements are inconsistent with the consistent stand that the Government of India has had. For example, I will just read out one or two paragraphs. The Key Negotiator writes to the Government of India saying. Every time we put across our Indian position, either the Americans or somebody else waves off the Minister's statement to us and tells us to clarify which the Indian position is, whether it is what we are arguing there, or, what the Minister had said elsewhere. When confronted with this situation, there are legitimate doubts which arise as to what happens to this principle of collective responsibility. After all, even in a system of collective responsibility, a Minister is an instrument, who represents the Government of India. Sir, I would just read what the negotiator writes. He says, "Earlier, in this Session, I had an occasion to point a verification of independent NAMAs, in the line of our brief. The U.S. Delegate, Jonathan

Pershing, took the floor to question my statement claiming that it was at variance with the recent statement of our Minister in New York. I responded by suggesting that the Delegates should speak on behalf of their own Government as they represent, and refrain from seeking to interpret the position of other Governments. I said that the Indian Delegation required no assistance in this regard. Mr. Persian has tendered a personal apology, but his initial off-the-cuff comment provided a clear clue of the United States' assessment of our stand that even though I was arguing something, the Minister's statement was something else." He then goes on to add, "This was confirmed during a subsequent bilateral meeting with the U.S. Delegation. We were informed in clear terms, that the U.S. interprets our Minister's offer of a WTO-like dialogue, as covering all the essential elements of the negotiations. On yet another occasion, the Chairman of the Annual Working Group (AWG) on the Kyoto Protocol invited us for consultations to sound us on the proposal of the developed countries to create a common forum for discussing the U.N.F.C.C.C and the Kyoto Protocol issues. The object of the proposal was to ensure the early demise of the Kyoto Protocol. Before commencing our negotiations, the Chairman handed over to me a copy of our Minister's interview in The Mint and invited me to read it. After politely glancing at the title, I passed it on the paper to another Member of the Delegation signalling thereby that we receive our instructions directly from our Minister and have no need to seek Ministerial guidance through columns of the newspapers. Obviously, however, the Chairman of the AWG was under the impression that the contents of the Press Report was such that they cause us to reconsider our position in the consultations." So, twice this has happened that in the course of consultations, our negotiators are confronted with Ministerial statements to the contrary. We then have the Report of the Times of India which Brindaji referred to. The Report may have exaggerated certain positions, but it does refer to a very important document. So, even in a Cabinet form of Government where international negotiations are at stake, the Minister's views are divergent from the consistent stand of the Government of India. We now have, the Times of India interview. Of course, the Minister almost dared the Member to verify the contents; but, let us see what happens thereafter, after that report in the Times of India. Now, this is a statement, which is in inverted comas, by our negotiator to The Economic Times after that report appeared, based on the Minister's document to the Prime Minister's Office.

The negotiator gives this interview in quotes: "In my view, the Prime Minister's Office has clarified the position in a more timely and welcome manner. It is now clear that the document in question is only a note for discussion and not official policy. It has been clarified that there will be no shift in stand on the basis of consensus and with the sanction of Parliament. This is most appropriate since climate change policy has always been on national consensus. It is anybody's privilege to suggest a radical or fundamental change. But people should avoid airing their views outside till it becomes official policy".

Sir, our concern today – and this is precisely what my friend, Amar Singhji, just now mentioned in his own customary style – is: how can we have such key negotiations going on on this issue where there has been a consistent stand of the Government of India and somewhat divergent view of the Minister? The Minister may fall in discipline and say that he will pursue whatever the stand of the Government of India is but, at the end of the day, others are also clever, if not cleverer; they see through our stand falling apart.

So, I would like the Minister to clarify in the course of his reply whether he is fully in agreement with the consistent stand that we have had in the last decade and a half or whether he feels that this requires a serious change and, therefore, if it requires a serious change, it is for the Government to consider whether we are following that stand or we require somebody who is ideologically committed to the stand to negotiate on behalf of the Government of India. Thank you very much.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN : Sir...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Put one question only.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: I will take one and-a-half minute only, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): One minute only.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Sir, I refer to the note that has been circulated by the Minister to different departments and I will quote two sentences here. It says, "India will make low carbon sustainable growth, a central element of its Twelfth Plan growth strategy. This will mean taking on commitments to reduce energy to GDP intensity and corresponding emission reduction outcomes for the year 2020". My question is: what is the basis of making a commitment for reducing the energy intensity of GDP for the entire economy as a whole? I will not go into the details of my first question.

My second question is: so far as global emissions are concerned, India's part is only 4 per cent, even less than 4 per cent. In per capita terms, India's position is 137th. So, we are not responsible for global warming.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Put your question.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: India did not create this problem of global warming. Therefore, what is our responsibility? It is the responsibility of the polluters, those who are polluting our world by the use of technology and emissions.

श्री प्रकाश जावडेकर (महाराष्ट्र) : सर, मैं सिर्फ एक ही question पूछना चाहता हूं। मंत्री महोदय के जिस पत्र को लेकर इतना सारा विवाद हुआ, मैंने कभी-भी नहीं देखा है कि मंत्री महोदय ने उस पत्र को डिनाई किया हो या पेपर पर defamation का केस डाला हो। इतने बड़े अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच तक यह केस जाता है, इसलिए कायदे से तो इनको नोटिस देना चाहिए था। क्या इन्होंने नोटिस दिया?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Mr. Minister, please.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I am grateful for the opportunity for having this Calling Attention Motion called. We have had nine speakers and the tenth one who asked a question. And, rather than respond to each individual speaker, I will just take some of the main issues that have been raised.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

I would like to reiterate, once again, Sir, that as the Minister for Environment and Forests, I stand prepared for any form of discussion at any point of time on any issue relating to climate change before the Copenhagen process starts on the 7th of December. I also want to reiterate two other points, Sir, as a reflection of the transparency with which I believe we should conduct the running of any Ministry, but particularly the Ministry that I have been holding since the 29th of May. As I said, I have written to all the Chief Ministers; I have written to 72 Members of Parliament. Admittedly, some Members of Parliament have been left out; an anomaly which I will rectify; and in that letter, I have tried to explain in as detailed a manner as possible what the Government's thinking is on climate change.

Sir, I have also at different points of time put on the website of our Ministry all the documentation that we have been bringing out from time to time on climate change, both the on technical aspects of climate change as well as the negotiating aspects of climate change. Sir, I have nothing to hide, and whatever criticism has been made, I will try to respond in as effective manner as possible. I just want to recall, Sir, that on the 18th of July, I was hailed by this very House as the great defender of India's sovereignty, when I, in front of the visiting U.S. Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton said that India will not take on legally binding emission reduction cuts. The Leader of the Opposition was gracious enough to compliment me personally. Four months later, I stand here being accused of having undermined India's sovereignty and in to American pressure. Sir, in four months, I don't think that I could have changed my position this dramatically. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please listen to me, Sir. I have listened very carefully, please listen to me. As I said, you may disagree with me. I am prepared to have a discussion with you. So, Sir, in four month's time, have not made any deviation from what remains a non-negotiable position for me personally and for the Government of India that under no circumstances will the Government of India accept a legally binding emission reduction cut as part of any international agreement. This is written in stone; this is cast in stone. This remains a fundamental non-negotiable for me personally; it remains the non-negotiable for all of us who are entrusted with the responsibility of negotiating the international agreement. India, under no circumstances, will take on legally binding emission reduction cuts, which we believe is the obligation of the developed countries, including the United States.

Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised a very pertinent question and so did the opening speaker, Mrs. Brinda Karat that why have these doubts surfaced now, and it is my duty to respond

to this question clearly and categorically. Sir, what I have been trying to do in the last six months is to introduce an element of flexibility in our position while we remained anchord in the basic principles of the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol and the Bali Action Plan. I have never, never – and I would like to make this clear to my friend, my colleague, Mrs. Brinda Karat advocated India's abdication of its position on the Kyoto Protocol. I have never said this. I have always believed that Annexe-I countries have a historical responsibility for fulfilling legally binding emission cuts and that the developing countries like India are obligated to take on nationally appropriate mitigation actions.

Sir, my only purpose has been to open up windows of flexibility for India because the world is changing; different countries are taking different positions. Brazil has announced emission reduction cuts; South Korea has announced emission reduction cuts; Indonesia has announced emission reduction cuts. And, my whole purpose is that India should not be isolated. That is my whole objective that the finger-pointing game should not start and the finger, the blame should not be put on India's door. So, flexibility is what I have been advocating.

Sir, hon. Member, Smt. Brinda Karat, said that I advocated giving up G-77. I have not said that, Sir. I have said that while we have one foot in G-77, we have to be mindful of other responsibilities that India has as an emerging, rising industrial power. In fact, Sir, if I may be permitted a personal word here, I went out of my way to negotiate a partnership agreement with China. The environment in our country was not conducive to an agreement with China. But, on 21st October, India and China signed a partnership agreement for collaboration on climate change. Why would I want to do it if I was an American stooge? Why would I want to sign an agreement with China knowing full well that China today is the world's largest emitter? It accounts for 23 per cent of the greenhouse gases and India is at number 5, at less than 5 per cent. Yet, I went to China, I spent 3 days in China; I and my Chinese counterpart negotiated an agreement. This was the first agreement for China, it was the first agreement for India; because we believed that China and India have common cause to resist the pressure of the developed countries to take on legally binding emission cuts.

Sir, I would like to recount a very interesting episode that had happened when we signed the memorandum of understanding or the partnership agreement with China on the 21st of October. The Chinese Vice-Chairman of the National Commission and Reforms Development, Shri Xie Zhenhua, was coming out after signing; and, the television journalists asked him, 'What is China going to do to ward off the pressure from America, to take on legally binding cuts?' Sir, to my surprise and to the surprise of the TV interviewer, Mr. Xie Zhenhua's reply was, "'Ward off pressure' is the wrong word. China seeks to engage the world." Sir, that is what we are trying to do. We are not here trying to

isolate ourselves or box ourselves into a corner, we would like a country of India's size, a country of India's aspirations to have its options open while clearly recognising the red line that we will never compromise on the issue of legally binding emission cuts. But we have to have the option open to have some flexibility. And we need to negotiate internationally not from a defensive position, but from a position of strength.

Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about my proposal for domestic legislation. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that this is a different position than what India's position was one year ago. Yes, it is a different position. It is a new idea, and my idea is that what we do domestically should be determined by us domestically in Parliament. What commitments we take on internationally is an entirely separate issue.

Sir, Mr. Sanjay Raut is not here; oh, he has just come back, Sir; he spoke about Mumbai. There is no country in the world which is as vulnerable to climate change as India, We are vulnerable because of our coastline. We are vulnerable because of the south-west and north-east monsoon. We are vulnerable because of the Himalayan glaciers. We are vulnerable because of our forest cover. There is no country in the world which is as vulnerable to climate change as India is. My position before I became a Minister and as Minister remains that it is in India's self-interest to respond creatively and aggressively to climate change as part of a domestic agenda. Sir, that is why I would like to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition, with whom I have spent some time to explain to him this thinking, that I put forward the concept of a nationally accountable mitigation outcome. What does it mean by nationally accountable? To whom? To the Parliament.

I am saying, let Parliament decide what these mitigation outcomes are. Parliament in its collective wisdom could pass a law, if that is what the Government wants and if that is what the Parliament wants. Let it pass a law. Let it enforce performance standards in transportation industry, in agriculture, in buildings, in forestry, in different sectors of the economy and let us be accountable to Parliament. Sir, I do not have to remind you – there are two distinguished Ministers of the previous to previous Government present here it is your Government that passed the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act. The FRBM Act of 2003 was passed by the NDA Government and I am saying is do a climate change conversion of the FRBM Act. That is all I am saying. Take domestic obligations, report to Parliament and whatever gets reported to Parliament come in the public domain. Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that now we are opening up whatever we are doing for international review. No, Sir. That is not the proposal. Whatever actions are supported by international finance and international technology will be open for international review. All those actions that are not supported by international finance and technology which we do domestically,

unilaterally on our own, we will make it open for international discussion, international consideration, international consultations. We are an open society. We are a democratic society. We have a media that is holding us accountable. We have a civil society that holds us accountable. We do not need monitoring, reporting and verification with some international body. Any Government in India goes through this monitoring, reporting and verification everyday in Parliament, in civil society and in the media. So, all I am saying is, as an open society, as a democratic society, as a Government accountable to Parliament, let us have the courage of our convictions. If we think that climate change is a serious issue which I believe it is, let us take on performance outcomes for ourselves. Sir, I must say here that we are great at producing plans in our country. But, we are very poor in converting plans into outcomes. Sir, you ask an Indian Government or an Indian civil servant or an Indian politician to produce an action plan. We will produce it very easily but what does it mean at the end? That is where China scores over us and that is what I want us to do. I want us to have the discipline to convert an action into an outcome and that outcome gets accountable to Parliament. Sir, for me Parliament is supreme. If I am accountable to Parliament I am accountable to no other body, national or international. Sir, the answer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is – the domestic norms and idea of mine – it is up to the Government to accept the idea of domestic legislation. That is being discussed now. Maybe we will have a comprehensive legislation. May be we will have part legislation. That process of discussion is on but the idea is that we convert the nationally appropriate mitigation actions which are very general in nature to nationally accountable mitigation outcomes which are very specific, which are accountable and which can be monitored easily. Sir, lot of references have been made to differing voices in the Government. Sir, I cannot deny that perceptions are different. I cannot deny that there has been a certain continuity of thought and I cannot deny that some of these ideas that I have tried to bring into the public domain – not in a back handed manner – I have tried to do it with a purpose, to create a new body of thinking which will give us some flexibility, some room for manoeuvre in the international sphere and it cannot be anybody's case, Sir, that we do not need this flexibility. We need this flexibility. We need this room for manoeuvre because frankly, Sir, I am under no illusions. We have huge problems of poverty. We have huge problems of unemployment but at the same time the world recognises India as an emerging power.

We are the fourth largest economy in the world. We will soon become the third largest economy of the world. We are a soft power growing for ourselves. We have aspirations for sitting in the international community of nations in a respectable manner. If we want to be accepted internationally, we should also be prepared to engage the rest of the world internationally. We should not smell a conspiracy in every attempt at engagement. This is only my request to you. If I were to do something in a hidden manner, if I were to do as a subterfuge, if I were to do in a backhanded way

with nobody knowing, with the hon. Prime Minister not knowing – there have been reports in the newspapers recently, my positions have deviated from what the hon. Prime Minister's directive was – there is nothing father from the truth in this. As a Minister in the Council of Ministers, if I flout the hon. Prime Minister's directive, I will not last for more than two minutes. I am bound by what the hon. Prime Minister tells me. The ultimate authority for me, as a Minister, is the Prime Minister. So, for any newspaper item and for any hon. Member to believe a newspaper item which says that I have flouted the hon. Prime Minister's directive, I categorically and comprehensively deny that. There is absolutely no truth in this rumour. But, at the same time, the caution that Mr. Amar Singh and Mr, Arun Jaitley have given, I would say that I am well aware of this that the domestic differences could be used internationally to weaken our negotiating position. I take full cognizance of this. I have, in my own way, in the last couple of weeks, tried to bring about greater coherence in our presentation and I assure the hon. Members that there will be no private enterprise in the Copenhagen negotiations. We are going as representatives of the Government of India. And, Sir, as a mark of my respect for Parliament, five months ago, I wrote a letter to the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha and the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha asking both of them to nominate four hon. Members of Parliament to join me in the delegation to Copenhagen. If I have something to hide, if I have to capitulate to the Americans in Copenhagen, will I take Members of Parliament with me and capitulate? I would capitulate in solitude. I would not capitulate with Members of Parliament breathing down my neck. So, I would humbly request the hon. Members to please look at what I have said in the context of trying to introduce a small element of flexibility and to ensure that India does not earn the reputation of a deal-breaker. The hon. Prime Minister's words to me, when 1 took over this Ministry on 29th May, were, 'We did not cause the problem of global warming. But, make sure that we are a part of the solution to global warming." And that is what I have tried to do. We have not caused the problem of global warming. But, increasingly, as Mr. NK Singh pointed out, if you look at the incremental emissions, India is, in absolute terms, not in per capita terms, an increasing contributor to the new stock of Co2 in the atmosphere. So, without getting into questions of who is responsible, I entirely agree that the polluter must pay. We do not have the 'polluter must pay principle' within India. How can we argue for polluter must pay internationally? Madam, for your information, I am trying to institute that the polluter must pay principle within India to begin with.

SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY: With retrospective effect?

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, today, the hon. Chairman of the Standing Committee on S & T has presented the Report on the National Green Tribunal. We are going to soon come forward with a National Environmental Protection Authority. What is all this for? This is to ensure that the polluter must pay domestically. The short point is, India must negotiate from a position of strength. India

must negotiate from a position of leadership and not negotiate from a position of defensiveness. We have nothing to feel defensive about. I would like to end here. I would like to respond, in writing, to each of the individual, specific points that have been raised. I will be responding to each hon. Member individually. But, let me reiterate that I stand prepared, at any point of time, to have a discussion on any issue open in as manner as possible. I have nothing to hide. I can assure Shri Amar Singh, Shri Arun Jaitley and all others that it will be my endeavour to ensure that the fears, which they have expressed on the lack of coherence or cohesiveness in the Government's view, will be addressed sooner or later.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, let us take up the legislative business, that is, Bills to be withdrawn. Lotteries (Prohibition) Bill, 1999.

GOVERNMENT BILL

The Lotteries (Prohibition) Bill 1999

श्री प्रकाश जावडेकर (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभापति महोदय, सरकार ने जब आज लेजिस्लेटिव बिजनेस रखा, उसमें Lotteries (Prohibition) Bill को देख मुझे लगा कि इसको पास करने के लिए कह रहे हैं, लेकिन यह तो वापिस लेने के लिए कह रहे हैं। इसलिए मुझे बड़ा दुख हुआ और मैं विरोध के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। मैंने स्टेटमेंट देखा reasons for withdrawal of Lotteries (Prohibition) Bill. उसमें सबसे बड़ा कारण क्या लिखा है,

"Since there was no unanimity on the aforesaid Bill in the Standing Committee, the Committee had suggested that the Government should explore the possibility of evolving a larger political consensus in the matter".

अब इसके आधार पर वे कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि स्टेंडिंग कमेटी ने एक दूसरे शब्द का भी उपयोग किया कि 're-look' करें। 're-look' का मतलब, वापिस लें, ऐसा नहीं कहा है। 1999 का यह बिल पास हो, जिसमें लॉटरी पर पाबंदी लगनी है। यह बिल पास होने के लिए कमेटी कह रही है कि यह पास होना चाहिए। कहीं भी कमेटी की प्रोसिडिंग्स में ऐसा नहीं आया कि यह बिल पास नहीं होना चाहिए, विद्ड्रो होना चाहिए। कमेटी की यह रिकमंडेशन है ही नहीं। तो कमेटी ने यह कहा है कि इसमें जो भिन्न राय है, तो इसको एक करना चाहिए, यह उन्होंने कहा है। अब मुझे कभी-कभी ऐसा आश्चर्य होता है पौलिटिकल कंसेंसस का। पौलिटिकल कंसेंसस की बात कहां से पैदा हुई? कोई जरूरी नहीं है, लोकतंत्र का मतलब मैजॉरिटी भी है। अगर मैजॉरिटी से सरकार बनती है, मैजॉरिटी से बिल भी बनते हैं, तो क्या जरूरत है लॉटरी जैसे एक ऐसे विषय पर कि जो समाज का विनाश कर रहा है उसके लिए पॉलिटिकल कंसेंसस बने और एक आदमी को या छोटे ग्रुप को एक ऐसा अधिकार मिले कि वह वीटो कर सके सामाजिक सुधार को? लॉटरी चलाना अच्छा है, ऐसा कौन कहेगा, आप भी नहीं कहोगे। क्या मंत्री महोदय यह कहने के लिए तैयार हैं कि समाज के लिए लॉटरी बड़ी अच्छी चीज है, लॉटरी बड़ी अच्छी चीज है समाज हित के लिए? क्या आप यह कहेंगे कि सब के लिए अच्छा है, इसलिए आप लॉटरी खेलो? मुझे यकीन है कि आप ऐसा तो